



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,677	05/26/2000	John Edmund Ahern	GB9-2000-0076-US1	3625

25259 7590 06/10/2005

IBM CORPORATION  
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.  
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195  
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/579,677	Applicant(s) AHERN ET AL	
	Examiner Charles E. Anya	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2005.  
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.  
 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:  
         1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
         2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
         3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
     \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*mu*

*PD*

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,649,102 to Yamauchi et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,649,184 to Hayashi et al.**

4. As to claim 1, Yamauchi teaches a method for simplifying control of a group of computer programs within a group of cooperating communication managers which access computer system resources held in computer system memory (figure 4 Col. 9 Ln. 9 - 56), the method including the steps of: providing a set of command target qualifiers specifically identifying at least one of the group of cooperating communication managers to which a command should be targeted (Packet 901 Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 18), wherein the set of command target qualifiers includes at least one command target qualifier indicating that a command should be targeted to members of the group of cooperating communication managers ("... to all computers..." Col. 12 Ln. 21 -23).

Art Unit: 2194

5. Yamauchi is silent with respect to providing connection services to each computer program within the up of computer programs to enable access to a shared access memory that is accessible to each of the group of cooperating communication managers and providing a set of scope definitions for association with respective computer system resources to determine the scope of access and change rights for the computer system resources and for determining whether computer system resources should be stored in said shared access memory, and for identifying computer system resources to which a command is to be applied by reference to their associated scope definitions.

6. Hayashi teaches providing connection services to each computer program within the group of computer programs to enable access to a shared access memory that is accessible to each of the group of cooperating communication managers (figures 6/7 Col. 6 Ln. 30 - 64) and providing a set of scope definitions for association with respective computer system resources to determine the scope of access and change rights for the computer system resources and for determining whether computer system resources should be stored in said shared access memory, and for identifying computer system resources to which a command is to be applied by reference to their associated scope definitions (figure 7 Col. 6 Ln. 65 - 67, Col. 7 Ln. 1 - 32).

7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hayashi and Yamauchi because the teaching of Hayashi would improve the system of Yamauchi by determining whether

Art Unit: 2194

providing integrity guarantee for resource should be performed in a local processing operation or shared processing operation (Hayashi Col. 5 Ln. 7 - 19).

8. As to claim 2, Yamauchi teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein respective ones of said scope definitions are associated with respective computer system resources in response to setting of a scope parameter during a computer system resource creation operation (figure 6 Col. 10 Ln. 24 - 35).

9. As to claim 3, Hayashi teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said set of scope definitions include a shared scope option for association with respective computer system resource, said shared scope definition determining that the respective computer system resource should be stored in said shared access memory (Col. 14 Ln. 31 - 42) and should be accessible to all cooperating communication managers in said group (Col. 6 Ln. 65 - 67, Col. 7 Ln. 1 - 32).

10. As to claim 4, Yamauchi teaches a method according to claim 3, including the step of saving a computer system resource to said shared access memory in response to specifying a shared scope during creation of the computer system resource (Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 23).

11. As to claim 5, Yamauchi teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein said set of scope definitions include a group scope option for association with respective

Art Unit: 2194

computer system resources, said group scope option determining that the respective computer system resources should be stored in said shared access memory (Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 18, Col. 9 Ln. 19 - 23) and that copies of said respective computer system resources should be created and stored in local storage of each cooperating communication manager in said group of cooperating communication managers (Col. 12 Ln. 21 - 23).

12. As to claim 6, Yamauchi teaches a command interface providing a set of commands having the following parameters: a command target qualifier, wherein particular parameters values of the command target qualifier determine which communication managers of the group of cooperating communication managers to which the command should be targeted (Packet 901 Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 23) and a scope definition, wherein particular parameter values of the scope definition are associatable with respective computer system resources and wherein a parameter value of the scope definition determines which of the respective computer system resources the command should be applied to by reference to their associated command target qualifier parameter values (Data Field 903 Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 23). Also see the rejection of claim 1.

13. 16. As to claim 7, Yamauchi teaches a command interface according to claim 6 wherein the set of commands includes a define command for defining a new computer system resource, wherein a scope definition parameter value specified in said define command is associated with said computer system resource in response to issuing the

Art Unit: 2194

command and wherein the scope definition parameter value determines the scope of access and change rights for the computer system resource (Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 23), While Hayashi teaches determining whether the computer system resource should be stored in a shared access memory which is accessible by all cooperating communication managers in said group or should be stored in unshared local memory of an individual cooperating communication manager indicated by said command target qualifier (Col. 6 Ln. 65 - 67, figure 7 Col. 7 Ln: 1 - 31).

14. As to claim 8, Yamauchi teaches a command interface according to claim 6, wherein said command target qualifier has at least a first specifiable parameter value, indicating that a command should be applied to all members of the group of cooperating, communication manager ("...broadcasting..." Col. 10 Ln. 51 - 54, "...all computers..." Col. 2 Ln. 21 - 23, Col. 19 Ln. 56 - 63) and a second specifiable parameter value indicating that a command should be targeted of an individual cooperating communication manager of the group of cooperating communication managers (Col. 12 Ln. 10 -18).

15. As to claims 9 and 11, see the rejection of claim 6.

16. As to claim 10, Hayashi teaches a data processing system according to claim 9 including: means for accessing a first memory from one of the group of cooperating communication managers, which the first memory is inaccessible from other members

Art Unit: 2194

of the group of cooperating communication managers (Col. 5 Ln. 41 - 55, Col. 8 Ln. 18 - 21) and means for accessing a second memory from said one of the group of cooperating communication managers which second memory is accessible from all member of the group of cooperating communication managers (Col. 8 Ln. 22 - 30) , wherein the set of commands includes a define command for defining a new computer system resource, wherein a scope definition parameter value specified in said define command is associated with said computer system resource in response issuing the command and wherein the scope definition parameter value determines the scope of access and change rights for the computer system resource (Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 23), while Yamauchi teaches determining whether the computer system resource should be stored in said second memory which is accessible by all cooperating communication managers of said group or should be stored in unshared memory of an the individual cooperating communication manager indicated by said command target qualifier (Col. 6 Ln. 65 - 67, figure 7 Col. 7 Ln. 1 - 31).

17. As to claim 12, Yamauchi teaches a method including the steps of: in response to a command being issued which specifies an operation and a command target qualifier, determining which cooperating communication managers within said group of cooperating communication managers to which the command should be targeted (Packet 901 Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 23), in response to the command specifying a scope definition, determining which computer system resources of the determined computer programs the operation is to be performed on and performing the operation on the



Art Unit: 2194

determined resources of the determined computer programs (Data Field 903 Col. 12 Ln. 10 - 23). Also see the rejection of claim 1.

18. As to claim 13, see the rejection of claim 7.

### ***Response to Arguments***

19. Applicant's arguments filed 2/17/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that (1) the Yamauchi and Hayashi prior art references are incompatible and as such fails to prove prime facie case for obviousness, (2) the Hayashi prior art reference does not teach determining the scope of access and changes rights for the computer system resources, determining whether the system resources should be stored in shared access memory and identifying computer system resources to which a command is to be applied, (3) the Yamauchi prior art reference does not teach at least one command target qualifier indicating that a command should be targeted to all members of the group of cooperating communication managers and (4) the Yamauchi prior art reference does not teach a command interface for a computer program for issuing commands for administration of the computer program.

Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's argument:

As to point (1), the two references are directed to managing access to shared data in a distributed system and as such are compatible.

As to point (2), the Hayashi prior art reference does teach determining the scope of access and changes rights for the computer system resources, determining whether the system resources should be stored in shared access memory and identifying computer system resources to which a command is to be applied by providing a conversion control unit that dynamically switches between local processing operation and shared processing operation based on the **access state** of the resource.

As to point (3), the Yamauchi prior art reference teaches at least one command target qualifier indicating that a command should be targeted to all members of the group of cooperating communication managers by providing a packet (packet 901) that includes a packet header containing a destination data field (destination computer field 904) (column 12 lines 10 – 12). The destination computer field as taught by Yamauchi on column 12 lines 22 – 23 includes more than one computer.

As to point (4), by providing a packet (packet 901) that includes a destination computer field the Yamauchi prior art reference provides particular parameter values (destination computer field) indicating which group of cooperating communication managers to which a command (packet 901) should be targeted.

### ***Conclusion***

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2194

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is (571) 272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cea.

Charles E Anya  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2194

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100